

REMARKS

I. Response to Rejections of Claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In this response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 6 and 8. Claims 1, 3 and 6 have amended to respond to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 1 has been amended by changing the language "an ethylene concentration of at least 10 mol %" to "an olefinic monomer concentration of at least 10 mol %." Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to introduce an antecedent basis for "reactor tube." Some other minor changes have also been made to claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8 to correct typos or to make the claims better to read. No new matters have been introduced by these amendments. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claim 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

II. Response to Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-3 and 5-8 for obviousness-type patenting over claims 1-8 of co-pending application ser. no. 10/572,816. Applicants have enclosed a terminal disclaimer to allow claims 1-3 and 5-8 to expire at the same time as claims 1-8 of co-pending application ser no. 10/572,816 if this co-pending application issues as a patent. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the double patenting rejection.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow remaining claims 1-3 and 5-8. Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to telephone their attorney, Shao-Hua Guo, at (610) 359-2455 if a discussion of the application might be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,
Shahram Mihan et al.

By: Shao-Hua Guo

Shao-Hua Guo
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,728
LyondellBasell Industries
Phone: (610) 359-2455
August 26, 2008

Customer Number 24114